REMARKS

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,810,436 (Wu) is respectfully requested on the grounds that the Wu patent fails to disclose or suggest a wireless receiving device capable of receiving and processing signals having different frequencies transmitted from a plurality of peripheral devices, as claimed, by:

- performing steps of a <u>first</u> predetermined process on a <u>first</u> signal having a <u>first</u> frequency;
- indexing the last performed step of the <u>first</u> predetermined process;
- performing steps of a <u>second</u> predetermined process on a <u>second</u> signal having a <u>second</u>
 frequency <u>different</u> from the first frequency;
- indexing the last performed step of the <u>second</u> predetermined process;
- <u>after indexing the last performed step of the SECOND predetermined process, going back</u>
 to the first predetermined process performing additional steps of the FIRST
 predetermined process (claimed as step (h), which involves looping back to step (a)),

and so forth until all of the steps of each of the procedures on each of the signals have been completed, thereby enabling <u>simultaneous</u> processing of each of the <u>different-frequency</u> signals from each of the different peripheral devices.

The device disclosed in the Wu patent is only capable of processing signals having one single frequency, and does not skip back-and-forth between corresponding first, second, etc. steps of multiple signal processing procedures for signals of different frequencies. As explained in col. 2, lines 34-44 of the Wu patent, signals from different devices are distinguished by ID codes composed of a product code and an identity code. When a signal is received, the peripheral sending the signal is identified based on the ID code and the device locks onto the device. There is no disclosure in Wu of (i) being able to receive and process signals of different frequencies.

and (ii) performing steps of a first process on a first signal, indexing the last performed step, and then performing steps of a second process on a second signal.

To the contrary, not only does the Wu patent fail to teach processing of signals having different frequencies, but the Wu teaches in col. 3, lines 4-14, that signals from only a <u>single</u> peripheral can be processed at one time:

...For instance, if there are mice A, B, and C, and the wireless receiving device I only receives message emitted by the mouse A currently, in order to switch to the state of only receiving message of the mouse B, it is only necessary let [sic] the mouse B function and the mice A and C not function. After the wireless receiving circuit 12 receives a wireless signal emitted by the mouse B, the learning procedure will let the micro-processing circuit 13 memorize the ID code representing the mouse B and lock on it. That is, the wireless receiving device only receives message emitted by the mouse B afterwards.

This passage states that the device of Wu can only "lock on" one signal at a time, and therefore Wu could not possibly have suggested the claimed processing of multiple signals by performing processing steps on the first signal, then on the second signal, and then on the first signal again (with indexes left to mark the return point in each different processing procedure), much less the claimed processing of signals having different frequencies.

While it is true that the device described in the Wu patent can process signals from different devices, it operates by locking onto a specific signal, processing it, and then sending "only" the processed signal to a computer via an interface circuit. The receiving device of Wu does <u>not</u> process signals of different frequencies, and does <u>not</u> even process signals from different peripherals at the same time, by processing each signal a few steps at a time, as claimed. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 USC §103(a) is improper and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Having thus overcome the sole rejection made in the Official Action, expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Serial Number 10/026,972

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA Registration No. 33,805

Date: April 13, 2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB:S:\Producer\beu\Pending I...PLULIUC 026972\u02.wpd